Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0380FL-1 for School Board of Polk County, Florida

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant articulates a comprehensive and coherent reform vision and it is centered on the four Race core assurance areas. Their approach is credible and clear because they describe comprehensive strategies to carry out personalized learning, such as: expanded technology, deepening community connections, constructivist learning, accelerating student achievement, increasing staff diversity, school improvement and turning around low performing schools. Their discussion of reforms appears to include several existing (pre-grant) initiatives that address all schools. The Race proposal is targeted at ten elementary and ten middle schools. It is unclear why none of the high schools are included in their Race grant reform vision.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

They provide convincing description and information about their rationale for school selection, participating students and educators and the specific numbers and groups to be served. These represent about 14,000 total students (of which about 4,000 are high need) and nearly 1200 educators. They do not discuss why high schools are not included. The applicant clearly describes how they used the state school rating/grading system (formerly AYP) to pick these high need schools. Nearly all proposed project schools are classified as either "F" or "D". A list of the 20 schools is provided including their sub group data. Elsewhere in the proposal (page 27, RTTD Chart and budget, etc.) they describe several other implementation activities that are not directly related to these schools. This is confusing because the reform vision does not clearly describe these other activities.

	Available	Score
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Their reform model will apply district wide and will be piloted at the target schools and "expanded" over four years. They also point to the importance of changing the district administration office (from specific departments/functions to interdisciplinary teams). They further describe several other district initiatives (that are not directly linked to the Race proposal), such as: family supports (pre-school ready to learn), multi-tiered supports, and College Board SpringBoard curriculum. These are all noteworthy initiatives, but do not clearly address this criterion. The applicant does not have a high quality plan describing how their reform grant will be scaled up to support district wide change

	Available	Score
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Their high need schools were identified (and assigned low ratings, AKA "grades") by the state on the basis of reading, writing, math and science proficiency on state tests. Polk details annual student learning goals in only reading for all pilot schools. It is unclear why math or other subjects are not also included. The reading data show baseline and projected growth. All of these seem ambitious yet achievable. The exception is Black students at Alturas Elementary where reading (baseline year) is 20 and is proposed to increase significantly to 73 in year two. This dramatic growth far exceeds any of the other subgroups at any of the pilot schools. No data tables (for student sub group goals) are presented for graduation rate and college enrollment (criteria c and d). In criterion A.1., Vision, they state that their district goals are: 85% of their 2015 freshman class will graduate on time and half of those will complete at least one year of college. Their response to criteria c and d are inadequate.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**5**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Polk provides several examples of their success record and background of positive reform efforts during the past four years. They cite some appropriate learning outcome data: positive, modest growth of SAT scores (Appendix. Pages 176+); AP Award for Equity; increased overall high school graduation rate. They continue and identify these as examples of other significant reforms: expanded AP courses, career academies in high schools and middle schools; and several STEM programs. The also present several convincing strategies for making student performance data available, such as: data portal and data day activities.

These items were not located in the proposal: four years of college enrollment data: four years of student achievement (Florida state test) in core subjects tested in K-12 areas. The absence of Florida state test data is a major weaknesse because these are used to identify low performing schools and priotity schools.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

They do not provide clear evidence that they make available the four expenditure categories specified in the criterion. They include a web link to find such information (which readers are not allowed to open). They further state that financial reports are available on the web site. Therefore, it cannot be determined if this section of the criterion is met. They also describe several other ways that policies are transparent, such as: public record requests.

	Available	Score
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative and appendix include several sources of evidence that the applicant will have sufficient autonomy and authority to implement their Race plan. The appendix has a written reply from the SEA that clearly validates their autonomy and authority as well as their alignment with relevant Florida laws and regulations.

	Available	Score
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There is considerable evidence that several stakeholder groups have been engaged in planning meetings and support the proposal. Evidence includes: extensive letters of support in the appendix; letters from participating schools; dates of at least four major stakeholder planning meetings; and the teacher association president's name is included in the official grant form cover page.

	Available	Score
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	**5**	**2**

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

They identify a variety of needs and gaps, such as: grade level retention/over age students; student emotional/behavioral needs; technology; early language development; student advisement; discipline and equity issues (including 2009 OCR report, appendix, page 185+. It includes several pages of data, but no interpretation). Most of these needs are anecdotal and not supported with clear and convincing data (i.e., evidence of severity and their relationship to student learning). These needs/gaps go beyond the 20 pilot schools and should have been at least mentioned in several of the earlier criteria. They also (page 82) plan to use Race grant funds to provide 40 additional mobile laptop carts in high schools. This is puzzling in light of the fact they propose to serve only specific, high need elementary and middle schools.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**16**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Extensive and detailed information about a variety of effective, innovative and high quality learning approaches and strategies are provided. These include: Targeted Diagnostic Inventory, Word Analysis, Assessment Portfolios, Comprehensive Instructional Sequence Model, culturally appropriate materials, Project based Learning, Webb's Depth of Knowledge Levels, college and career ready standards and requirements, and technology coaches. They also describe several strategies and circumstances when students will actively be involved with their teachers. For example, only teachers and students will collaborate in the Assessment Portfolio. Parent involvement and participation appear to be minimal. This is an area where parents would greatly benefit from more involvement.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	**20**	**15**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal describes a comprehensive list of training and professional development that will be offered to the staff. These include traditional workshops as well as offerings through the innovative Florida Digital Educator/University of South Florida. The plan covers an array of convincing topics and strategies aimed at improving instruction, assessment, curriculum, and personalization. Information from the educator evaluation system will also be used to shape quality professional development.

The areas which lack sufficient description and detail are: 1) all educators engage in professional teams or communities and 2) school leadership teams have training and resources. The plan only says schools are "encouraged" to establish leadership teams. There are scant specifics about these two components raising questions whether these are fully functioning in the pilot schools.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**10**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal clearly and thoroughly addresses criterion a, c, d and e, organizing the central office to provide support and services to participating schools and other related specific components. They describe several past and current support activities and programs as well as potential, innovative new supports, such as deploying interdisciplinary teams to schools by region. Criterion b, providing school leadership teams sufficient flexibility and autonomy, is only briefly mentioned with a short sentence (p. 106-7) that autonomy is afforded with the understanding that working conditions pay and benefits must be bargained. No school-level autonomy examples or policies are provided.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**10**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan includes systems (Genesis and Parent Portal) that provide parent access to children educational information and places students on individualized paths. Students can log on at home and at work. Interoperable data systems are present. Appropriate levels of technical support are described. The project also seeks to ensure that all participants have access to affordable high speed internet service. This criterion is met and has no weaknesses.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**8**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The plan describes several levels of monitoring progress toward project goals. These include the LEA Accountability and Evaluation Department, a project director and an Associate Superintendent. These include: monitoring, measuring and sharing project information, professional development and staffing. The overall project consists of serving 20 high need schools with personalized and effective teaching and learning, three major improvement indicators (cited in the Purpose section, page 10) as well as seven complex, related projects (Graph, page 27). Several of these components do not have clear, written goals so

monitoring their progress will be challenging. This section lacks clarity on what exactly will be measured and how. Finally, they do not provide a thorough strategy for implementing a rigouous continuous improvement process as defined in this criterion.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Most of the discussion consists of describing how there was solid communication and engagement in the plan development process. Once the project is funded, the only example is that the district home page will be a vehicle for feedback. There are no details of on-going communication and engagement strategies, such as standing advisory committees, school leadership teams, reports from each of the seven projects, or principal reports, etc.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Performance measures include: number of highly effective teachers and principals; student literacy growth, discipline referrals, other behavioral data, and some middle school indicators (i.e. advisement, career plans, and interest inventories). In addition, another table presents 12 specific academic performance measures for various grades, subjects, grade retention, and technology). There is no clear, written description of: each criteria, rationale for measures, how measures will provide rigorous information, and how these will be reviewed and improved if they are insufficient to gauge progress.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the applicant does not describe any plan for evaluating the effectiveness of their programs and services, nor do they discuss how they will make decision about using grant resources more productively. Most of this narrative re-states what their various project activities/services will be, such as technology, instruction, professional development and school restructuring. Note: in criterion E.1, there are some evaluation plan components, but they do not sufficiently describe a plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A detailed and thorough budget is presented and it includes separate budgets for each of the seven project components. These include clear and succinct rationales with explanations of the need and the relation to the overall project. Costs are reasonable and sufficient. They also provide general information about other potential funding sources; no specific amounts or budgets are included for these.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The discussion about long-term sustainability is minimal. A high quality and detailed plan is not provided. They write that much depends upon the economic recovery in the state and region. It is a strength that the Race project director position will continue with Title II funding after the Race project ends.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

A partnership is presented with several, diverse organizations. Their stated target is literacy, but the two performance measures are about reducing chronic student absenteeism. They do not present a coherent plan that describes additional

student/family supports that address social, emotional or behavioral needs. Instead, they list specific, separate programs/services that several of the partners already provide independently. There is no discussion how they would scale up the plan or how results would improve over time.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	**Met**

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

See strengths described in several criteria, particuary C.1. Learning and C.2, Teaching and Leading.

Total	210	132

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

No optional budget supplement included in proposal.

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0380FL-2 for School Board of Polk County, Florida

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The School Board of Polk County, Florida offers desire and hope but inadequate structure upon which to develop a comprehensive reform vision.

- The four core educational assurance a areas are sparsely addressed.
- Narrative offers insufficient, documented evidence of their prior efforts.
- Therefore, the applicant receives a low score because of the vague support provided that would qualify as articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform.

	Available	Score
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

SBPCF describes a detailed process in the selection of schools.

- SBPCF clearly identified targeted schools according to their state grading system.
- SBPCF included elementary, middle, and high schools which includes low incomes students from various communities in the selection process.
- The detailed explanation of their state's grading system that led to identifying the participating schools was unclear.
- SBPCF's variation of school selection were identified by the grading system of Florida schools.
- The schools selected were not only failing schools, but schools with a letter grade of B to F.

Despite the grading verbiage, it is clear from the accompanying charts that the participating schools were well chosen, warranting the applicant a high score.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	**10**	**4**

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The ambitious vision and platform presented to ensure students will graduate as career and/or college ready was evident, however, the proposal presented lacks the elements of a high quality plan.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	**10**	**4**

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The extent to which the applicants' vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA are vaguely addressed. The applicant's narrative does demonstrate some criteria points, however a clearly defined progression of the vision for improved student learning and academic performance is lacking.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	**15**	**5**

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant delivers documentation to support B-1, which includes an increased graduation rate of 85% of the 2015 high school freshman class graduating on time, since 2007-2008 has an increase of 8.5% in the rate of students graduating, an increase in SAT mean scores, and in the school year 2007-2008, the graduation rate of 57.90 and in 2010-2011 the rate increased to 66.40%. This percent increased exceeds the state.
- The narrative mentions a significant increase in academies offering career opportunities, however the information was not accompanied by a track record of supportive data.
- The applicant did not show adequate, clearly defined track record of reform in persistently low-achieving schools, resulting in a low-medium range score.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	**5**	**3**

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

While the applicant presented solid evidence of allowing stakeholders and the public the opportunity to request copies of salaries and budget reports, with a simple request to the Superintendent, they did not provide sufficient evidence of how they will increase transparency in the LEA processes, practices, and investments, thus resulting in a medium score.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	**10**	**8**

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Relative to the criteria contained in B3, applicant provided a response with document District SEA Comments, p. 190 and 191, a clearly documented reference to regulatory requirements or statutory code.
- Applicant mentions right to a franchise of Florida Virtual School as satisfactory reference to B3 criteria.
- The association and SEA comments validates a commitment from the application, to the education reform and is valid, resulting in a high score.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF has documentation of direct input from parents, parent organizations, the business community, advocacy groups, principals, families, teachers, and more.
- Emphasis is focused on civic and business groups as highlighted contributors to SBPCF's school strategy, including this grant proposal.
- Several letters of support are provided.

Applicant provides a general view of stakeholders and their written commitment to support LEA. Various letters of support from key stakeholders were provided, although missing is evidence or documentation or a mention of students, therefore a medium score was given.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	**5**	**3**

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF sets forth multiple points related to analysis needs and gaps.
- These points address applicants current measuring, tracking capability and the extent to which SBPCF desires to show gains resulting from its vision of reformation.
- SBPCF is aware of their inability to implement highter-level student/teacher support programs.
- Language development and early reading readiness is an area of focus which currently includes a mobile library for at-risk students.
- A comprehensive, logically sequenced set of tools identifying the gaps, analysis of needs, including how proposal will address them was obscure.

Applicant displays sporadic evidence of a high-quality plan by identifying various elements of the grant proposals definition of high quality in some, but not all of their presented plans. Given the incomplete compliance of applicant's adherence to all elements, a medium score is given.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	**20**	**15**

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF outlines a robust and ambitious vision and platform to ensure students graduate, career and college ready.
- SBPCF does not currently have staff or structure in place to actuate such an ambitious program.
- The listed goals and processes are comprehensive and extensive.
- Given the current state of infrastructure, SBPCF will need significant lead-time prior to documented positive results.

Applicant conveys a good grasp of requirements of a high qualty plan through evidence provided. It is unclear if applicant has infrastructure or can develop students with tools as described herein. However, applicant presents a robust plan, and as such receives a high score.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	**20**	**15**

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF provides detailed, multi-layered plan to help teachers prepare students for college or careers.
- SBPCF identifies tools, plans, workshops and programs that provide education of teachers and principals with researched-based instructional strategies for their students, which would result in college-ready or career-ready graduates.
- Nor should they be expected to do so within the near future due to lack of trained personnel or infrastructure to do so.

SBPCF currently has no track record of implementing similar tasks.

The extent to which the applicant proposes an approach that includes an approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards clearly identifies the intent to bolster teacher development through three full-time positions which will maintain a focus on consistent coaching, training, professional development and data gathering and analysis. Further, applicant identifies courses, programs and classes that teachers are encouraged to complete. The totality of this evidence results in a high score for the applicant.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**7**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF currently has in place basic level vestiges of practices and policies needed to implement their reform vision.
- District leadership is moving toward developing and deploying, as yet unnamed and un-numbered teams, to assist a specified block of schools standardized their teaching and learning approaches.
- SBPCF does not specifically in address infrastructure within this section.
- It is clear from their narrative that SBPCF is in the early stages of appropriate infrastructure development.
- Applicant evolved from Problem Solving/Response to Intervention model to (MTSS) Multi-Tiered Support System. This system offers some evidence of facility efforts to support and facilitate personalized learning. Applicant participates in, or proposes to initiate several other data-driven programs that offer personalized information per student which guides the response from school staff.

These proposals satisfy qualifications for a high-quality plan related to this category criterion to a moderate degree, resulting in a medium score.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant currently has in place basic levels, vestiges of practices and policies needed to implement their reform vision.
- District leadership is moving toward developing and deploying, as yet un-named and un-numbered teams, to assist a specified block of schools standardize their teaching and learn approaches.
- SBPCF does not specifically address school infrastructure within this section.
- It is clear from their narrative that this district is in the early stages of appropriate infrastructure development.

Applicant addresses portions of the qualifications needed for a designated high-quality plan. All elements are not uniformly addressed, which decreases the likelihood and expectations of becoming a high-quality plan, resulting in a mid-range score.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	**15**	**10**

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF offers a novel interpretation of continuous improvement. Instead of the conventional implementation of

continuous quality improvement, applicant opts for adoption of a more fluid and dynamic goals and strategies definition.

- A clearly outlined continuous improvement process
- SBPCF chose to emphasize a dynamic, fluid process with shifting goals, rather than the prevailing standard methodology.

Applicant provides an obscure process that would not qualify as a high-quality plan for continuous process improvement as prescribed in this proposal, therefore a medium score is given.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF listed names of stakeholders, including other civic groups.
- It was unclear of the ongoing communication frequency or method.
- The narrative focused solely on means of communicating status of the RTT-D via website.
- Lacking were identification of other internal and external stakeholders significant to formulating, implementing and sustaining education reformation visions, such as this grant.
- All of the above generates a low score from the evidence.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF offers required number of performance measures.
- The sub-set of requirements listed in E3 (a, b, c) were not adequately addressed, particularly "c".
- Measures were consistent with the plan as outlined.
- SBPCF, pending organized labor negotiations, did not include a section of the performance measuring tool.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF assigned their emphasis on math and literacy proficiency of students in grades K-3; reducing retention rates in grade-3; accelerating learning efficiencies of students behind in grades 4-8; modeling programs to help transition 6th graders to middle school.
- SBPCF lists eight tools to measure effectiveness of accomplishing these goals.
- LEA list three target areas designated to measure effectiveness of accomplishing these goals.
- These goals as stated, are non-specific, generalized and broad in scope, but applicant expands to show how they will demonstrate effectiveness of their activities according to category criterion.
- As such, the applicant receives a low score.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF provides detailed funding expenditures for the grant proposal.
- SBPCF lists detailed narrative for employment of personnel to carry out proposal.
- SBPCF also lists current funded partnerships that are critical to sustaining goals of the proposal.
- Partnerships have resulted in a five-year master plan to create career academies that will assist SBPCF with one of its key performance measures.
- Other listed criteria contained in F2 (Sustainability and Growth) were not adequately addressed in applicants narrative.
- Applicant's proposal contains sufficient detail, forsight into reasonable use of grant monies.
- Narrative explains application of funds in a thoughtful, rationale way.
- The collective degrees of compliance with the criterion expected here, leads to a high score.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant offers a limited plan for project sustainability.
- Applicant does not engender confidence in aligning a sound effort to maintain and sustain their high quality proposal.
- Applicant for the most part, will continue to rely on Federal funding, United Way and home state economic recover for project sustenance.
- This lack of a clearly laid out, convincing sustainability program leads to a low score.
- Applicant missed elements of a high quality plan.
- Applicant fails to present timelines and responsible parties, resulting in a medium score.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- SBPCF delivers insufficient documentation to describe the required interaction between LEA and public and private entities to maintain and or enhance the reformation proposal.
- SBPCF does in fact engage with numerous private and public agencies to deliver student assistance leading toward increased readiness to learn through preschool literacy, after-school care and similar initiatives.
- Lacking are the ten population based desired results for students of grant applicant.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant delivers sufficient documentation to describe the required interaction between the LEA and public and private entities to maintain and or enhance the reformation proposal.

Total	210	124

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0380FL-3 for School Board of Polk County, Florida

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision using personalized learning, applied and constructive learning, and work within the core assurance areas.

- Schools will emphasize mastery rather than seat time through the expanded use of technology.
- The district has established a high school model for applied learning through career academies.
- The instructional approaches will be restructured to provide constructive learning.
- Teachers will be trained to act more as facilitators to learning.
- Students will meet standards through building on their interests and strengths.
- An in-house data system is in place with full capacity to integrate process and content.
- Students will have daily access to performance feedback.
- The Job Embedded Leadership Development Project will allow for more effective principals in lowest achieving schools.
- Resources are focused more heavily at the lowest achieving schools.

Overall, the applicant articulates a comprehensive and coherent vision based on credible approaches to reform.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a quality LEA and school-level implementation by selecting schools needing the most support and ten schools that are already piloting personalized learning.

- The selection process includes Florida's accountability system targeting priority or near-failing schools.
- Ten schools selected are already piloting personalized learning.
- A list of the 20 participating schools was made available.
- 13,802 students will participate in the project with 89% of the students coming from low-income families.
- All student subgroups participating in the project were included in the demographics chart.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of a high-quality approach to system reform with appropriate descriptions of the selection process and demographics to be served.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a comprehensive plan to scale-up to district-wide implementation through a four-pronged approach but failed to address all the elements of a high-quality plan including linking goals to activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

- The reform model will begin at the 20 project schools and be scaled-up district-wide over a period of four years.
- The district will seek partnerships with industry and business to better understand end-user personal computing to enhance personalized learning.
- Best use of resources will be made through focusing all central office functions on building school capacity to improve teaching and learning.
- Offices will be reinvented from specializing in a specific function to interdisciplinary teams that provide wrap-around services.
- Personnel evaluation will focus on teaching and learning in all disciplinary and non-academic areas.

Overall, the applicant provides a strong description of how they plan to scale-up district-wide and reach outcome goals but fail to provide the elements of a high-quality plan. Although the applicant left out some of the components of a high-quality plan, they score in the low end of the high range due to their strong description of their scale up plan.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that their vision is likely to result in improved student learning and equity through increased engagement, improving student progress, and boosting rigor.

- One focus will be on preparing Pre-K to learn by expanding partnerships in the community and expanding family-based

- activities to increase school readiness skills.
- 85% of the students will grade 2 will achieve reading proficiency through the Multi-Tiered Support System.
- The district will be flexible by studying multi-grade grouping, advancement based on mastery - not seat time, and flexible advancements for students struggling in one area.
- (A) Annual Measurable Objectives set by the Florida Department of Education will be the methodology to assess proficiency and growth.
- A chart provides ambitious growth goals by subgroup.
- (B) Each targeted schools has goals to decrease the achievement gaps by subgroup over the course of the grant.
- (C) Insufficient information was provided on the future impact on graduation rates due to the reform in grades PK-8.
- (D) Insufficient information was provided on intended outcomes regarding college enrollment rates based on the work of the proposal.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence to support improved student learning and equity. Annual goals for closing achievement gaps are ambitious and attainable. Insufficient information was provided on outcomes for graduation rates and college enrollment.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant provides evidence of significant success in graduation rates, minority scores on the SAT and AP exam, and reducing the percentage of over-aged students.

- Polk County has seen an 8.5% increase in graduation rates which exceeds the state increase.
- Polk County has exceeded Florida and the U.S... in increases in SAT mean scores among minority groups.
- The district has reduced its' over-aged elementary population by 65% and middle and high school over-aged population by 47% using innovative strategies. Inadequate information was provided on state test scores.
- Polk County surpassed the state average in mean scores for minorities on AP testing.
- No information was provided on college enrollment rates.

Overall the applicant has a clear record of success of improving student learning (graduation rates, minority scores on AP and SAT, decreased over-aged population) but fails to provide information on college enrollment.

B. The applicant provides evidence of significant reforms to turn-around lowest achieving schools.

- One school in the district was labeled as one of the state's lowest achieving schools and was transformed to a successful school within two years.

Overall, the applicant has a successful track record in turning around persistently lowest achieving schools by restructuring leadership and focusing resources on effective teachers and meeting student needs.

C. The applicant provides evidence of a comprehensive data system available to teachers, parents, and students which includes an online system as well as teacher student data conferences.

- The district has developed an Interactive Data Evaluation and Assessment System along with "Data Day" and a parent portal to make performance data available to students, teachers, and parents which informs, improves participation, instruction, and services.

Overall, the applicants provides evidence of a self-developed data system which can be modified to meet the needs of the proposal and makes pertinent information easily available to teachers, students, and parents.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of a clear record of success in advancing student in all key areas with increases surpassing the state increases but fails to provide information on college enrollment or adequate information on state test results.

	Available	Score
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of an adequate level of transparency and already makes information available in the required categories.

- Personnel salaries are posted by district and school level. Individual salaries can be obtained by submitting a request to the superintendent.
- Finances of individual schools are public record and posted to the district website or made available upon request.
- Financial reports posted also contain costs by student and general operations.
- Practices and policies are made available for review online and at public meetings to ensure transparency at each school.

Overall, the applicant proves an adequate level of transparency in processes, practices, and investments through online means, individual reqeusts, and public meetings.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence that there are successful conditions and autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments.

- Florida is a Race to the Top state and Polk County has been working closely with the state, and even piloting some state initiatives which only supports the successful conditions to implement the personalized learning environments.
- Florida requires all districts to go to digitally formatted instructional materials by the year 2016 which supports the efforts of the Polk County proposal for personalized learning environments.
- Florida applied and has been granted the federal waiver which gives the flexibility to carryout the activities of the proposal.
- Florida DOE provides districts autonomy under the state Race to the Top grant to carryout similar activities that support the state grant.

Overall, the applicant has a record of working with the state Race to the Top programs and a federal waiver which provides conditions and autonomy for success in the proposal.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development and support of the proposal.

- Key stakeholders involved in the development of the proposal are: ESOL Parent Leadership Council, Healthy Start Coalition, Heartland for Children, Head Start Policy Council, Mid-Florida Credit Union, Public Education Partnership, PRIDE Youth Program, READ Polk, Standup Polk, United Way of Central Florida, and UthMpact Coalition.
- The proposal builds off of the ongoing work of the School Improvement Plan. Parents, educators and businesses/agencies were involved through the District Advisory Committee. All schools are represented as well as partnering outside agencies.
- No information was provided as to, if appropriate, the proposal was revised based on all stakeholder engagement and feedback.
- The applicant has proof of support from the teacher union but unsufficient evidence of their engagement in revisions.
- Letters of support from key stakeholders are provided but only has four letters of support from the 20 participating schools.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of stakeholder engagement and support but fails to provide sufficient evidence of, if applicable, revisions made based on stakeholder input..

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of their current status in implementing personalized learning environments but fails to provide evidence of a high-quality plan with timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

- Data provided supports keeping students on grade level to increase graduation rates.
- Other identified gaps include the need for multi-tiered student support, early language development, middle school

> advisement, and academic rigor.
> - Identified gaps and needs support the logic behind the proposal's reform strategies.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of the logic behind their reform model based on the identified needs and gaps but fails to provide the elements of a high quality plan including timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant provides evidence that they use strategies to engage and empower all learners.

- Students understand more about their learning goals through teacher conferences, Google Apps charted progress, and Advisory Programs that are available daily.
- Progress toward goals is supported through data charts, student established learning goals, mini and baseline assessments, Compass Learning, and personalized learning environments.
- Deep learning experiences are supported through project based learning, collaborative structures, scientific investigation, and "accountable talk".
- Students have access to diverse cultures and content through culturally and developmentally appropriate resources and online resources to provide better understanding of global issues.
- Critical academic content will be mastered through collaborative structures.
- Students will be taught to apply research-based reading strategies.
- Students will utilize common note-taking strategies.
- Teachers will work as facilitators for problem based learning.
- Parents will be informed through the parent portal and training on Google Apps Progress Chart

Overall, the applicant provides evidence that the proposal engages and empowers all learners in an age-appropriate manner.

B. The applicant provides evidence that all students will have access to personalized learning, high quality content, continuous feedback and accommodations for high quality strategies.

- Each student will have an personalized assessment portfolio to document what they have learned and motivate them on the goals they have set.
- Teachers will hold "data chats" with students to let them know where they are and keep them on track.
- Instructional media will be available to students for personalized learning.
- Students will receive daily, small-group instruction in literacy skills based on needs.
- At risk and low achieving students will progress through levels to a 3rd grade literacy level.
- Teachers will model higher order thinking skills.
- Questioning strategies will be used to promote critical thinking.
- Scaffolding, pacing, and probing techniques will be used when asking questions.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence that high quality content and feedback in the context of personalized learning will be provided.

C. The applicant provides evidence of support to students to ensure they understand how to use the tools and resources.

- The Tech Coaches will train teachers in the use of tools and how they can help students use the tools effectively.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence that students will have the necessary support to effectively use the tools through Tech Coach training and teacher support.

In summary, the applicant provides evidence of a sufficient plan for improving teaching and learning that engages and empowers all learners by providing a personalized sequence of instructional content, high-quality content, and training and support to students to ensure they can use the tools effectively but fails to provide evidence of a high quality plan with timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

	Available	Score
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A. The applicant provides strong evidence that all participating educators engage in training that supports their capacity to improve instruction.

- A train-the-trainer model is used for major professional development on the Core Curriculum.
- The state provides Coaching Cycle Training for Academic Instructional Facilitators.
- Model classrooms will be identified with experts for each of the academic areas.
- Teachers analyze data from ongoing assessments to determine student levels of deficiency and proficiency.
- Technology Coaches attend trainings so they can in turn keep teachers up to date on technology integration.
- Ongoing local collaboration will be done through Google Apps and video conferencing.
- Project based learning will be differentiated and identifies individual student areas of academic interest.
- Questioning strategies are designed to promote critical and creative thinking.
- Teachers meet with administration to redirect the instructional focus and to ensure that interventions and strategies provide remediation and enrichment strategies for appropriate students.
- Teachers maintain updated data for all students to monitor student progress.
- School leadership and staff are trained on performance appraisal instruments.
- Schools and district leadership are visible and serve as instructional leaders.
- Resources are provided to assist teachers and principal interventions.
- Teacher's Action Research Goals and Educational Timeline is used for individual teacher improvement.
- Keeping students on track for graduation is discussed but to description is provided for how students will be made college and career ready.
- Insufficient evidence was provided on professional learning teams or communities.

Overall, the applicant provided evidence that teachers engage in training to support their capacity but provided insufficient evidence of development and use of professional learning communities.

B. The applicant provides sufficient evidence of the teachers having access to, and know how to use, tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress.

- Teachers are trained, utilize, and have access to projection devices, manipulatives, and a range of technology to support delivery of instruction.
- Comprehension Instructional Sequence Model and Springboard instructional processes use previewing and high level student engagement strategies.
- Teachers have access to online district texts, programs, and videos.
- Digital resources such as Google Apps survey and Smart Responses are available to meet students needs and additional grant funding will provide additional skills-based software licenses.
- Insufficient information is provided about college and career readiness in building teacher capacity.
- Insufficient information is provided about the tools available to create and share the new resources.

Overall, the applicant provides sufficient evidence of teachers having access to tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress through research-based programs. Insufficient evidence is provided related to building teacher capacity concerning college and career readiness and the availability of tools to create and share the new resources.

C. The applicant provides strong evidence of teacher training, policies, and resources to structure an effective learning environment to meet the needs of learners.

- District leadership trains school leadership and staff on performance appraisal instruments and school and district leadership serve as instructional leaders by offering coordinated professional developed addresses needs from data analysis.
- School and district leadership systematically collect and analyze multiple types of data to improve student learning.
- Teachers participate in ongoing professional through the district, state, and PD360 for individualized training based on needs.

Overall, the applicant provides strong evidence of effective teacher training, policies, and resources to structure effective learning environments, increase student achievement, and close achievement gaps.

D. The applicant provides strong evidence of increasing the number of students who receive instruction from highly effective teachers and principles.

- The Job Embedded Leadership program prepares highly effective principles to work in lowest achieving schools.
- Administrative staff and teachers who have a history of poor learning gains are replaced with more effective staff.
- Policies include bonuses for retention of teachers showing learning gains in Priority Schools.

Overall, the applicant has a system in place to increase teacher effectiveness, retain effective teachers, and build effective principals while replacing ineffective teachers.

In summary, the applicant provides evidence of a strong plan to improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment but fails to provide information regarding college and career readiness or about tools available to create and share the new resources, lacked evidence of the use of Professional Learning Communities and did not include the elements of a high quality plan which includes timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	**15**	**11**

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has policies and infrastructure in place which provide the support and resources teachers and students need but fails to provide the elements of a high quality plan including timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

- The Curriculum and Instruction offices are being restructured to deploy interdisciplinary teams to provide more effective support for all schools.
- School leadership teams are afforded the autonomy to carry out activities to meet the needs of the students exclusive of items that impacted working conditions and benefits.
- E2020 is used for credit recovery for middle school students while the project will also provide flexible promotions based on mastery rather than seat time.
- CollegeBoard Springboard curriculum will allow middle school students the flexibility to demonstrate knowledge in multiple ways.
- Insufficient information was provided on the adaptability of the resources to meet the needs of all students.

Overall, the applicant provided evidence of comprehensive policies and infrastructure to support project implementation including reorganizing central office, school leadership team autonomy, and credit based on demonstrated mastery but failed to provide sufficient evidence that the learning resources and practices are adaptable and fully accessible to all students or the elements of a high quality plan including timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

	Available	Score
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	**10**	**7**

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence of LEA and school infrastructures that support personalized learning without evidence of a high quality plan including timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

- Insufficient information is provided on how all participating students and parents will have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources regardless of income.
- Tech Coaches and teachers provide technical support for parents and students in the effective use of the available tools.
- Genesis, Parent Portal, and Discovery Learning allow students to use data in other electronic formats and offer other learning supports.
- Interoperable programs include SAP, Genesis, IDEAS, and Journey for human resources data, student information, data, budgets, and instructional improvement systems.

Overall, the applicant provides ample evidence that resources and support for the resources are appropriate and interoperable but lacks sufficient evidence that all parents and students regardless of income will have access to the content and resources or the elements of a high quality plan; timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Therefore the applicant receives a score within the lower end of the high range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score

(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a rigorous continuous improvement process with continuous feedback on progress but fails to provide evidence of a high quality plan including timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

- A director will be hired to coordinate all aspects of the proposal.
- Work team leaders and the evaluator will coordinate routinely with the director to monitor fidelity of implementation.
- The initiatives of the proposal will be examined for effectiveness and feasibility and adjusted accordingly.
- The components of the proposal blend with the district School Improvement Plan which focuses all district personnel on the implementation of the proposal.
- No information is provided about how information will be shared on the quality of the results of the proposal.

Overall the applicant provides strong evidence of a rigorous continuous improvement process with continuous feedback but fails to provide information about who the district will publicly share information on the quality of its investments through this proposal or the timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties to qualify the plan as high quality.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strong evidence of strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders.

- Drafts of the proposal work plan are posted on the school district's web page with a vehicle for feedback.
- A work team of more than a dozen departments, teachers and twelve schools formulated the work plans.
- Numerous external stakeholders are involved with the proposal but insufficient information was provided as to how they were engaged with the project and the amount of communication with them.

Overall, the applicant provides strong evidence of strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal stakeholders but fails to provide sufficient information as to how external stakeholders are involved in communication and engagement.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided ambitious and achievable performance measures.

- Ambitious and achievable measures are set for subgroups. The applicant was unable to provide the baseline and performance measures for all participants pending district and union negotiations with the Florida Department of Education.
- The rationale for selecting the measures was not given.
- The measures provided are rigorous and provide formative information regarding implementation effectiveness.
- Insufficient information was provided as to how the applicant will review and improve the measure over time if needed.

Overall, the applicant provided ambitious and achievable evidence for 9 performance measures which are written to provide formative information for implementation success but failed to provide the rationale for selecting the measures or how the applicant will review and improve the measure if needed.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a sufficient plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposal activities but fails to provide details of how this will be accomplished or how it will be used for continuous improvement.

- The grade-level status of at-risk, over-aged students will improve through digital individualized learning plans.
- The district will report to stakeholders on all pertinent factors regarding implementation and success including

personalized learning, district restructuring to improve implementation, and the extent to which the community is mobilized.
- The project will track key areas related to the progress and effectiveness of the grant but failed to provide details as to how the data will be analyzed and used to continuously improve the project.

The applicant provides sufficient evidence of a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the projec tbut fails to provide details of how this will be accomplished or how it will be used for continuous improvement. This places the applicant's score in the medium range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides sufficient information on all funds to be used to support the proposal along with a rational plan with funds allocated in areas to support the personnel, activities, and implementation of the proposal.

- All funding to support the grant were identified including state Race to the Top funds, other federal funds, external foundations and other school improvement funds available.
- The Workforce Florida grant and Ford Partnership for Advanced Studies are used to support the proposal goals and will continue the funding for the Career Academies and college and career readiness. Title II, Carl Perkins, Title III and SIG funds also are used to support the proposal goals and will continue for sustainability after the life of the grant.
- Polk Vision along with United Way, the Library Cooperative,Early Learning Coalition, and Polk Education Foundation already provide funding and support for literacy initiatives which also support the vision of the proposal.
- The budget narrative clearly describes the use of the funds which is reasonable in relation to the funds allocated for personnel and supplies and equipment necessary to effectively implement the goals of the proposal.
- Thoughtful rationale was put into the budget in that it addresses funding for the key components and activities of the proposal in order to carry out the activities.
- No delineation was made between funds that will be used for one-time investments or ongoing during the proposal.

Overall, the applicant provides a reasonable and sufficient budget for the proposal with all funding sources and rationale behind the fund allocation but fails to provide information on which funds are for one-time use and which are ongoing during the project.

	Available	Score
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a strong plan for sustainability including phasing RTTT-D funding for personnel over to other federal funds by the end of the grant and a substantial group of partners who will continue to provide funds to continue the activities of the proposal. The applicant failed to provide the elements of a high-quality plan.

- The director's salary will be phased over to another funding source by the end of the grant period to support sustainability.
- Workplace Florida and Ford Partnership for Advanced Studies will continue to provide funds to support the efforts of the grant.
- Literacy initiatives as part of the proposal will continue through the efforts and funding of several partnerships with Polk Vision, United Way, the Library Cooperative, Early Learning Coalition, and Polk Education Foundation.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of a strong plan for sustainability but fails to provide the elements of a high-quality plan such as timelines and responsible parties.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of numerous partnerships, primarily focusing on literacy.

- Since 2004, Polk County has been in partnership with 7 public initiatives to improve literacy.
- The applicant works with the United Way to gather data and monitor progress toward goals for students under the umbrella of United Way. United Way provides training and funds for gathering and storing the data.

Overall, the applicant has evidence of meaningful partnerships with public entities and businesses but lacks clarity in how some of the partnerships support the efforts of the proposal other than literacy.

The applicant provides evidence of population level desired results that align with the proposal.

- Polk Vision partnership works to increase the graduation rate and the percentage of children who enter Kindergarten ready to learn.
- Early Learning Coalition offers early childhood fiscal services.
- Head Start works to increase parent engagement to prepare students to enter school
- Polk Education Foundation provides fundraising to link resources with educational needs of the students.
- Polk Media Services provides interactive literacy instruction in neighborhoods feeding into the proposal schools.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of partnerships that promote population level desired results to support the goals of the proposal.

The applicant describes how the partnership will track the outcomes for the United Way initiative and how the United way initiative provides services for students with significant challenges.

- United Way has in place a system to track progress of students under the United Way programs through the Polk County schools.
- No other information is provided as to how progress is tracked with the other initiatives.
- Information from the United Way initiative is used to target resources to students with the most need but no other information was given on how the other initiatives use the data to target resources for improved results.
- A plan in place to scale-up the model beyond the proposal and many of the initiatives already serve students not participating in the proposal.
- The Work Leaderships Teams and director will monitor the effectiveness of the activities and adjust to improve the services over time.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of tracking outcomes with once Agency but fails to describe how the other partnership outcomes will be tracked. A plan for scale-up is in place and the initiatives will be monitored and adjusted to improve services over time.

The applicant fails to provide sufficient evidence of how partnership services will be integrated within the participating schools.

- The applicant will reorganize several office to develop interdisciplinary teams to provide wrap-around services.
- Insufficient information was provided as to how partnership services will be integrated within the participating schools.

Overall, the applicant failed to provide sufficient information as to how the partnership services will be integrated within the participating schools.

The applicant provides some evidence of how the partnerships will build capacity of staff in participating schools by providing tools and supports.

- The United Way partnership provides training and a data base for teachers to monitor students within the umbrella of the United Way services.
- Insufficient evidence is provided as to how the proposal will identify and inventory the assets of the school and community that are aligned to the goals of the proposal.
- 48 education projects are sponsored by United Way and each are honing their projects to include strategies such as certified teachers as tutors to increase student achievement.
- Insufficient evidence is provided as to the creation of a decision-making process to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of the students.
- Parents are being involved in the decision-making process through the Parent Leadership Council.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence of meaningful and sustainable partnerships but lacks clarity in how the services are integrated within the schools or how the agencies are involved in the decision-making process.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of how they will build personalized learning environments based on the core educational assurance areas.

- Polk County's approach to personalized learning is to build on current areas of academic focus by adding enhancements.
- Technology will play a role in building on students strengths and interests and emphasizing mastery rather than seat time.
- Teachers and students will have individual learning plans to meet their specific needs.

Overall, the applicant provides evidence throughout the proposal of a coherent plan for building personalized learning environments based on the core educational assurance areas.

Total	210	161